"CVFFP" Technical Team Meeting
DWR Central District
August 7, 1998

Present: Dan Odenweller-DFG, Bill O'Leary-USBR, Shawn Mayr-DWR, Tina Swanson-UCD, Bob Fujimura-DFG, Kevan Urquhart-DFG, Steve Ford-DWR, Marianne Hallet-NRCS, Randy Beckwith-DWR, Ted Frink-DWR,

Absent: Rick Wantuck-NMFS, Larry Puckett-USFWS, Charlie Liston-USBR, Elise Holland

Excused: Serge Birk, Jim Buell

o Reviewed the Roles and Procedures

Discussed the communication and coordination role briefly, and explained the request for the review of the three sets of study proposals. Discussed a consensus based process, to avoid voting, as the desired approach.

Limited to technical reviews of the proposals, without considering funding sources or other items such as the direction of the CalFed process. The proposals were submitted by Kevan Urquhart for DFG-Bay Delta, Ted Frink for the DWR-UCD Treadmill study, and Charlie Liston for the USBR-TFFIP.

o DFG-Bay Delta Proposals

DFG-Bay Delta provided six study proposals, in a memorandum dated 07/28/98 from Kevan Urquhart. They were treated in the same order as they appeared in the memorandum

A1- "Determining the pre-screen loss rates at Clifton Court Forebay of species entrained into the State Water Project."

Technically OK (some risk associated with the screw traps at gates), would provide data on species other than CS and SB.

Similar approaches (including pushnetting and hydroacoustic sampling) have been proposed and rejected in the past. We might want to upgrade this study to a higher level of effort by employing more than one sampling technique.

A2- "Evaluation of Pre-screen Loss at the Skinner Delta Fish Protective Facility Using Wild or Habituated Fish."

Technically OK (may be difficult to complete due to the need to make collections of

"wild" fish).

A3- "Effects of Covering the Secondary Louvers at the Skinner Fish Facility."

OK- This has been a long standing study proposal, which could be rather easily implemented and evaluated.

A4- "Evaluation of the Effects of Collection and Transport on the Acute Survival of Fish at the Skinner Delta Fish Protective Facility, with Emphasis on Delta Smelt and Splittail."

Study somewhat common with a USBR question, this effort might be tackled by a joint effort of the two programs.

We continue to lack the final component of system loss estimation, dealing with the fate of the fish released to the system. That is, do the fish we "release alive" from the release sites survive.

A5- "The Effect of Collection and Transport on the Long-term Survival of Chinook Salmon at the Skinner Delta Fish Protective Facility."

This is another hatchery fish proposal, due to fish constraints. While an excellent study, which would help answer questions about our fish loss estimates, it suffers from the oft repeated criticism regarding the use of hatchery fish.

A6- "Monitoring Predation at CVP-TFCF and SWP-SDFPF Release Sites in Response to the Release of Salvaged Fish."

Very feasible effort to undertake and complete. Consider adding a stomach content element to this study.

Four additional study elements were provided for information purposes, although they were not subject to review at this time. They included:

B1- "Evaluation of the Modification of the Suisun Salinity Control Gates on Adult, Fall-run Chinook Salmon Passage."

B2- "Evaluation of biotelemetry for tracking juvenile chinook salmon." Second year of a continuing study.

B3- "Adult Fall-run Chinook Salmon Movement in the Lower San Joaquin River and South Delta."

B4- "Developing a Methodology to Accurately Simulate the Entrainment of Fish into Agricultural Siphon Diversions in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta."

o DWR/UCD Treadmill Study

Ted Frink (memo dated 07/29/98) provided a copy of the new draft contract (revised 07/10/98) and the 06/15/98 draft QA/QC plan for the study effort. The proposal does not include the use of CS, AS, or SB. Without these data sets, there is no chance to relate the work in this new test flume to the earlier work. We may then be unable to use this tool to evaluate the datasets for use in revising the biological design criteria.

To avoid this problem, we should emphasize two study elements:

a) American shad approach velocity failures in the dark, which required a 0.2fps (or lower approach velocity) to protect them, and

b) juvenile chinook salmon tests (for fish <35mm) to assist us in evaluating the NMFS bypass spacing criterion (60 seconds between bypasses).

o USBR TFFIP Elements

No specific proposals were suggested, we received a memorandum dated 07/17/98 from Charlie Liston which included:

o "A Proposed Evaluation and Study Activities for FY 1998," dated June 1987, which included a conceptual drawing of the proposed test facility to be built at the Tracy facility.

o A one page update (dated 05/15/98) of significant activities, and

o the previously distributed list of questions, dated March 9, 1998.

o E-mail reviews were to be sent to me by 0800 on 08/13/98.

To date (8/14/98) comments have been received from Marianne Hallet (NRCS), and Ted Frink and Steve Ford (DWR). I have attached copies of those comments to this document.